1	Pamela M. Egan, WSBA No. 54736 (proportion of the control of the c	o hac vice)
2	1905 7 th Ave. W Seattle, WA 98119 Telephone: (415) 297-0132	
3	Email: pegan@potomaclaw.com	7 T
4	Attorneys for Mark D. Waldron, Chapte	r / Irustee
5		
6		
7 8	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
9	In re:	Case No. 18-03197 FPC 11
10	GIGA WATT, Inc., a Washington corporation,	The Honorable Frederick P. Corbit
11	corporation,	Chapter 7
12	Debtor.	OBJECTION OF THE CHAPTER 7
13		TRUSTEE TO MOTION FOR STAY PENDING APPEAL OF ORDER (I)
1415		APPROVING THE SALE OF MOSES LAKE EQUIPMENT AND RELATED RELIEF, (II) APPROVING BID PROCEDURES
16		
17	(the "Trustee") hereby objects ("Objection	ons") to the Motion for Stay Pending
18	Appeal of Order (i) Approving the Sale o	f Moses Lake Equipment and Related
19	Relief, (ii) Approving Bid Procedures (th	e "Motion") [ECF 769] on the ground
20	that the Motion is constitutionally moot b	because the sale that the Motion seeks to
21	stay has already closed. This Objection is	s based on the Declaration of Mark D.
22	Waldron, filed herewith, and the facts and arguments set forth below.	
23	Trustee's Objection to Motion	
24	for Stay Re ML Equipment Sale - P a g e	1
25 18	3-03197-FPC7 Doc 812 Filed 11/23/20	Entered 11/23/20 17:23:18 Pg 1 of 4

1	PROCEDURAL HISTORY	
2	On November 19, 2018, the Debtor commenced this case by filing a	
3	voluntary petition for relief pursuant to Title 11, Sections 101, et seq. of the	
4	United States Code (the "Bankruptcy Code").	
5	On September 30, 2020, the Court entered its Order converting the case	
6	from one under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code to one under Chapter 7 of the	
7	Bankruptcy Code [Doc 744].	
8	On October 20, 2020, the Court entered its Findings of Fact and	
9	Conclusions of Law in Support of Order Authorizing Trustee's Sale of Moses Lake	
10	Equipment [Doc 764] and its Order: (i) Approving the Sale of Moses Lake	
11	Equipment and Related Relief, (ii) Approving Bid Procedures, and (iii) Shortening	
12	Time to Object (the "Sale Approval Order") [Doc 765]. The Sale Approval Order	
13	provided in pertinent part:	
1415	The Chapter 7 Trustee is authorized to proceed with the Sale on terms that are no less favorable to the estate than the terms of the Sale Agreement pursuant to an oral auction to be conducted by the Chapter 7 Trustee.	
16	conducted by the Chapter / Trustee.	
17	Sale Approval Order [Doc 765], p. 4, ¶ 2, lines 1-3. The Sale Approval Order	
18	further provided, "The 14-day stay provided by Rule 6004(h) of the Federal Rules	
19	of Bankruptcy is waived." Sale Approval Order [Doc 765], p. 4, ¶ 6, lines 8-9.	
20	As set forth in the Chapter 7 Trustee's Report of Sale of Moses Lake	
21	Inventory / Equipment [Doc 776], filed on October 23, 2020, the Trustee held the	
22		
23	Trustee's Objection to Motion	
24		
25 18	3-03197-FPC7 Doc 812 Filed 11/23/20 Entered 11/23/20 17:23:18 Pg 2 of 4	

1	oral auction on October 20, 2020 and Soluna Technologies Ltd. ("Soluna") made
2	the winning bid in the amount of \$112,000.
3	The sale closed on October 22, 2020 with the receipt of the purchase price
4	in the amount of \$112,000, the delivery of a Bill of Sale to Soluna, and the
5	delivery of the assets to Soluna. See Waldron Declaration.
6	Jun Dam filed the Notice of Appeal [Doc 770] and the Motion [Doc 769] on
7	October 22, 2020. On October 26, 2020, the Court issues its Notice Re: Failure to
8	Note Motion for Stay Pending Appeal [Doc 781], in which the Court notified all
9	parties in interest that the Court would not consider the Motion "until proper
10	notice is given" pursuant to the Local Bankruptcy Rules. On October 30, 2020,
11	Jun Dam served notice of the Motion [Doc 794].
12	POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
13	Federal courts cannot decide moot issues. As the Supreme Court stated
13 14	Federal courts cannot decide moot issues. As the Supreme Court stated more than a century ago:
	more than a century ago: The duty of this court, as of every other judicial tribunal, is to
14 15	more than a century ago: The duty of this court, as of every other judicial tribunal, is to decide actual controversies by a judgment which can be carried into effect, and not to give opinions upon moot questions or
14 15 16	more than a century ago: The duty of this court, as of every other judicial tribunal, is to decide actual controversies by a judgment which can be carried
14 15 16 17	more than a century ago: The duty of this court, as of every other judicial tribunal, is to decide actual controversies by a judgment which can be carried into effect, and not to give opinions upon moot questions or abstract propositions, or to declare principles or rules of law
14 15 16 17	more than a century ago: The duty of this court, as of every other judicial tribunal, is to decide actual controversies by a judgment which can be carried into effect, and not to give opinions upon moot questions or abstract propositions, or to declare principles or rules of law which cannot affect the matter in issue in the case before it.
114 115 116 117 118	more than a century ago: The duty of this court, as of every other judicial tribunal, is to decide actual controversies by a judgment which can be carried into effect, and not to give opinions upon moot questions or abstract propositions, or to declare principles or rules of law which cannot affect the matter in issue in the case before it. Mills v. Green, 159 U.S. 651, 653, 16 S.Ct. 132, 133, 40 L.Ed. 293 (1895).
14	The duty of this court, as of every other judicial tribunal, is to decide actual controversies by a judgment which can be carried into effect, and not to give opinions upon moot questions or abstract propositions, or to declare principles or rules of law which cannot affect the matter in issue in the case before it. Mills v. Green, 159 U.S. 651, 653, 16 S.Ct. 132, 133, 40 L.Ed. 293 (1895). In this case, the Motion is moot because the sale, which the Motion seeks to
114 115 116 117 118 119 220	more than a century ago: The duty of this court, as of every other judicial tribunal, is to decide actual controversies by a judgment which can be carried into effect, and not to give opinions upon moot questions or abstract propositions, or to declare principles or rules of law which cannot affect the matter in issue in the case before it. Mills v. Green, 159 U.S. 651, 653, 16 S.Ct. 132, 133, 40 L.Ed. 293 (1895). In this case, the Motion is moot because the sale, which the Motion seeks to stay, has already closed. See In re Akhlaghpour, 2018 WL 3357367, at *1–2
114 115 116 117 118 119 220 221	The duty of this court, as of every other judicial tribunal, is to decide actual controversies by a judgment which can be carried into effect, and not to give opinions upon moot questions or abstract propositions, or to declare principles or rules of law which cannot affect the matter in issue in the case before it. Mills v. Green, 159 U.S. 651, 653, 16 S.Ct. 132, 133, 40 L.Ed. 293 (1895). In this case, the Motion is moot because the sale, which the Motion seeks to stay, has already closed. See In re Akhlaghpour, 2018 WL 3357367, at *1–2 (Bkrtcy. C.D. Cal., 2018) (motion to stay sale of property moot after sale closed). The Trustee properly conducted the auction and closed the sale pursuant to the
114 115 116 117 118 119 220 221 222	more than a century ago: The duty of this court, as of every other judicial tribunal, is to decide actual controversies by a judgment which can be carried into effect, and not to give opinions upon moot questions or abstract propositions, or to declare principles or rules of law which cannot affect the matter in issue in the case before it. Mills v. Green, 159 U.S. 651, 653, 16 S.Ct. 132, 133, 40 L.Ed. 293 (1895). In this case, the Motion is moot because the sale, which the Motion seeks to stay, has already closed. See In re Akhlaghpour, 2018 WL 3357367, at *1–2 (Bkrtcy. C.D. Cal., 2018) (motion to stay sale of property moot after sale closed).

25 | 18-03197-FPC7 | Doc 812 | Filed 11/23/20 | Entered 11/23/20 17:23:18 | Pg 3 of 4

1	Sale Order. See Matter of Combined Metals Reduction Co., 557 F.2d 179,	
2	190 (9th Cir. 1977) ("An appeal will not affect the validity of a judgment or order	
3	during the pendency of the appeal, absent a stay or supersedeas."); Rockin	
4	Artwork, LLC v. Bravado International Group Merchandising Services, Inc., 2017	
5	WL 2215804, at *2 (W.D. Wash., 2017). Accordingly, the Court cannot grant	
6	relief on the Motion. Sale cannot be stayed because it has already closed, making	
7	the Motion moot.	
8	<u>CONCLUSION</u>	
9	WHEREFORE, the Trustee respectfully requests that the Court deny the	
10	Motion in its entirety and grant such other and further relief as the Court deems	
11	appropriate and just.	
12	Dated: November 23, 2020 POTOMAC LAW GROUP PLLC	
13		
14	By: <u>/s/ Pamela M. Egan</u> Pamela M. Egan (WSBA No. 54736)	
15	Attorneys for Mark D. Waldron, Chapter 7	
16	Trustee	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23	Trustee's Objection to Motion	
24	for Stay Re ML Equipment Sale - P a g e 4	
25 18	-03197-FPC7 Doc 812 Filed 11/23/20 Entered 11/23/20 17:23:18 Pg 4 of 4	